CITY OF SANTA BARBARA
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, PLANNING DIVISION

INITIAL STUDY/ ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST MST2004-00235

PROJECT: 535 E. Montecito Street, "Los Portales" Project

June 30, 2007

This Initial Study has been completed for the project described below because the project is subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and was determined not to be exempt from the requirement for the preparation of an environmental document. The information, analysis and conclusions contained in this Initial Study are the basis for deciding whether a Negative Declaration (ND) is to be prepared or if preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to further analyze impacts. Additionally, if preparation of an EIR is required, the Initial Study is used to focus the EIR on the effects determined to be potentially significant.

APPLICANT/ PROPERTY OWNER

Applicant: Bermant Homes

Applicant Representative: Lisa Plowman, Peikert Group Architects

Owner: Housing Authority of the City of Santa Barbara

PROJECT ADDRESS/LOCATION (See *Exhibit A-Vicinity Map*)

The 1.78 acre project site is located at the northwestern corner of East Montecito Street and Calle Cesar Chavez and is commonly known as 535 E. Montecito Street. The site is in the Lower East neighborhood of the City of Santa Barbara.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (See *Exhibit B-Project Plans*)

Project Components:

The proposed project consists of 48 residential condominium units (24 two-bedroom and 24 three-bedroom units) in six, three-story buildings. The total development is 90,966 square feet (net). Each building is 15,161 square feet (net) and includes eight units (4 two-bedroom units and 4 three-bedroom units) and eight two-car garages in a tandem configuration. Two additional parking spaces would be provided onsite for guests, for a total of 98 parking spaces. Vehicular access to and from the site is provided by two driveways along Calle Caesar Chavez and one driveway on E. Montecito Street. All units are to be sold at below-market prices, with prices to be determined by the total costs to develop the units.

Construction: The applicant estimates that project construction would require 18 months to complete from the commencement of grading and site preparation through building construction and landscaping. As the site is vacant, no demolition work is required. Project staging would occur on site. Construction parking would be provided onsite and at an undetermined off-site location.

Required Permits: In order for the project to proceed, the following discretionary approvals are required:

1. Specific Plan with a zoning overlay to permit a below market rate residential development in the M-1 zone district (SBMC§28.92).
2. Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map (TSM) for a one lot subdivision for the construction of 48 residential condominiums (SBMC§27.20).
3. Modification to allow less than the required number of guest parking spaces (SBMC§28.92.110).
4. Design Review approval by the Architectural Board of Review (SBMC§22.68).

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Existing Site Characteristics

Topography: Topography of the site is generally flat with an elevation of approximately 9 feet above mean sea level. The site slopes very slightly to the south and east.

Seismic/Geologic Conditions: Geologic conditions onsite are characterized by 4-6 feet of uncompacted fill underlain by estuarine deposits at depths of 20-30 feet. Groundwater onsite is high, measured at 0.2-0.6 feet below the surface in 1994

and 5-7 feet below the surface in 2004. The City's Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) and the geotechnical report prepared for the project identify the potential for liquefaction to occur as a result of earthshaking. The potential for expansive soils is low. The potential for seismic hazards is high.

Flooding/Drainage: The project site is located within the 100 year flood plain as shown on the Flood Insurance Rate maps. Drainage from the site sheet flows to the south and the east. The site is within the Laguna Channel watershed and is subject to flooding during major storm events.

Biological Resources: The project site is located within an urban area and is vegetated with non-native specimen trees and ruderal vegetation of limited habitat value.

Archaeological Resources: A Phase I Archaeological Resources Report was prepared and accepted by the Historic Landmarks Commission in 1989. No resources were identified onsite and the site is not considered to have the potential for onsite resources.

Noise: The project site is currently subject to noise levels of up to approximately 65 Ldn dBA. The primary noise source affecting the site is vehicular traffic on Highway 101.

Hazards: Chlorinated solvents were present in shallow groundwater beneath the project site and were the subject of a remediation plan that was executed in 1999. The site was considered remediated and the case was closed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board on June 26, 2002. A March 2006 soil gas survey was conducted to determine if chlorinated hydrocarbons from nearby contaminated sites had migrated to groundwater beneath the site. The soil gas survey found that chlorinated hydrocarbons levels are well below the California Human Health Screening Level.

PROPERTY CHARACTERISTICS

Assessor's Parcel Number:	031-350-010	**General Plan Designation:**	Industrial
Existing Land Use:	Vacant	**Parcel Size:**	1.78 acres
Zoning:	Existing: M-1, Proposed: M-1 with Specific Plan to permit residential development	**Proposed Land Use:**	48 residential condominium units, 96 residential parking spaces and 2 guest parking spaces
Slope:	Less than 2%		
SURROUNDING LAND USES:			
North:	Retail commercial and machine shop, M-1 zone district		
South:	Office/industrial building, M-1 zone district		
East:	Casa de la Raza (community center), M-1 zone district		
West:	Office building and associated parking, M-1 zone district		

PLANS AND POLICY DISCUSSION

Land Use and Zoning Designations:

The project site is designated Industrial by the General Plan Land Use Element. The site is zoned M-1, Light Manufacturing. Permitted uses in the M-1 zone include medical offices, retail service providers such as grocery stores and beauty shops, warehousing, storage and manufacturing. Dwelling units are not permitted except as accessory buildings incidental to the use of the land. As part of the project, a Specific Plan is proposed for the property that would create a zoning overlay and allow residential development on this site. Approval of a Specific Plan would provide for conformance with zoning requirements.

General Plan Policies:

Various sections of this Initial Study make reference to applicable General Plan policies and ordinance provisions. The EIR to be prepared based upon the conclusions discussed below will provide a further analysis of potential project consistency or inconsistency with the City General Plan elements, including the Land Use Element, Circulation Element, Conservation Element, Scenic Highways Element, Noise Element, Seismic Safety-Safety Element and other applicable

plans and policies. Additional discussion of policy consistency issues will subsequently be provided in the staff reports to the Planning Commission and City Council. Final determinations of project consistency with applicable policies will be made by the decision-makers as part of their action to approve or deny the project proposal.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will be prepared for the subject project in compliance with Public Resources Code §21081.6 and will be included in the EIR. The mitigation measures suggested in the Initial Study may be refined or augmented through the EIR process. Monitoring and reporting requirements are adopted as conditions of project approval.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

The following checklist contains questions concerning potential changes to the environment that may result if this project is implemented. If no impact would occur, **NO** should be checked. If the project might result in an impact, check **YES** indicating the potential level of significance as follows:

Significant: Known substantial environmental impacts. Further review needed to determine if there are feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives to reduce the impact.

Potentially Significant: Unknown, potentially significant impacts that need further review to determine significance level and whether mitigable.

Potentially Significant, Mitigable: Potentially significant impacts that can be avoided or reduced to less than significant levels with identified mitigation measures agreed-to by the applicant.

Less Than Significant: Impacts that are not substantial or significant.

1. AESTHETICS Could the project:		**NO**	**YES** ***Level of Significance***
a)	Affect a public scenic vista or designated scenic highway or highway/roadway eligible for designation as a scenic highway?		Less than Significant
b)	Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect in that it is inconsistent with Architectural Board of Review or Historic Landmarks Guidelines or guidelines/criteria adopted as part of the Local Coastal Program?		Less than Significant
c)	Create light or glare?		Less than Significant

Visual Aesthetics - Discussion

Issues: Issues associated with visual aesthetics include the potential blockage of important public scenic views, project on-site visual aesthetics and compatibility with the surrounding area, and changes in exterior lighting.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Aesthetic quality, whether a project is visually pleasing or unpleasing, may be perceived and valued differently from one person to the next, and depends in part on the context of the environment in which a project is proposed. The significance of visual changes is assessed qualitatively based on consideration of the proposed physical change and project design within the context of the surrounding visual setting. First, the existing visual setting is reviewed to determine whether important existing visual aesthetics are involved, based on consideration of existing views, existing visual aesthetics on and around the site, and existing lighting conditions. Under CEQA, the evaluation of a project's potential impacts to scenic views is focused on views from public (as opposed to private) viewpoints. The importance of existing views is assessed qualitatively based on whether important visual resources such as mountains, skyline trees, or the coastline, can be seen, the extent and scenic quality of the views, and whether the views are experienced from public viewpoints. The visual changes associated with the project are then assessed qualitatively to determine whether the project would result in substantial effects associated with important public scenic views, on-site visual aesthetics, and lighting.

Significant visual aesthetics impacts may potentially result from:

- Substantial obstruction or degradation of important public scenic views, including important views from scenic highways; extensive grading and/or removal of substantial amounts of vegetation and trees visible from public areas without adequate landscaping; or substantial loss of important public open space.
- Substantial negative aesthetic effect or incompatibility with surrounding land uses or structures due to project size, massing, scale, density, architecture, signage, or other design features.
- Substantial light and/or glare that poses a hazard or substantial annoyance to adjacent land uses and sensitive receptors.

Visual Aesthetics – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

1.a) Scenic Views

The project site is located in an urban environment in the Lower East neighborhood of the City of Santa Barbara and is currently vacant. Existing development in the project vicinity includes a mix of one- and two-story retail, office/industrial and institutional uses.

The project site is located one block north of Highway 101, which has been identified as eligible for scenic highway designation. Southbound Highway 101, in the project vicinity, provides existing scenic views across the built urban environment to the Riviera and the Santa Ynez Mountains. These views are considered a significant visual resource. Northbound Highway 101 in the project vicinity offers primarily urban views across the City and to the Santa Ynez Mountains in the far distance.

The proposed project involves construction of six, three-story structures that measure 42 feet in height from the finished grade to the top of the ridge of each building. Photosimulations of the project have been prepared by the applicant (see Exhibit C). As viewed from southbound Highway 101, the project would block views through trees of the lower Riviera, but would not block views of the Santa Ynez Mountains. The project site is viewed more peripherally from northbound Highway 101, and is thus more difficult to see. The upper levels of the structure are visible from this view and partially block distant views of the mountains. This view also includes an existing three-story building located between the project site and the highway. Because the project site is currently vacant, there is a view of the Riviera and the Santa Ynez Mountains when looking across the project site from Montecito Street. This view would be substantially blocked by the proposed project; however, this area of Montecito Street does not have any important public viewing areas (such as parks or public gathering spaces) or designated open space areas where the public would spend considerable time contemplating the view of significant scenic resources. The project would not change existing skyline views as seen from Highway 101 nor would it significantly obstruct or change scenic views of the mountains and hillside areas of the City but would add building mass in close proximity to the highway. This impact is considered adverse, but less than significant.

1.b) On-Site Aesthetics

The proposed project design consists of six, three-story buildings that incorporate Mediterranean style architecture with red tile roofs and plaster finish. The ground level includes tandem parking spaces for all units as well as a bedroom for the three-bedroom units. The second floor contains the living room and kitchen areas for each unit and the third floor contains two bedrooms for each unit. The proposed structures would have a total height of 42 feet above finished grade. Varied roof lines, window and balcony openings, and separations between the buildings help to reduce the overall appearance of mass of the development.

The architectural design was reviewed by the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) on four occasions. On the first three occasions, the ABR reviewed a four-story, 90 unit, mixed-use project and there was concern regarding the size and bulk of the project. For the fourth review, in September of 2006, the project had been substantially revised. This was in response to comments received by the ABR and by the City Council at the August 8, 2006 concept review meeting. Revisions to the design include a reduction in the height, bulk and scale of the project, the elimination of the fourth floor, elimination of all commercial spaces, elimination of the parking structure, inclusion of tandem parking, and reduction in the number of residential units from 90 to 48. The Board found the revised 48-unit proposal supportable as it contains smaller buildings, provides more usable ground level space and has less overall mass than the previous proposal (see Exhibit D). The project is required to receive final review and approval by the ABR for consistency with design guidelines for views, visual aesthetics and compatibility, and lighting. Therefore, it is anticipated that the project's onsite aesthetics impacts would be less than significant.

1.c) Lighting

The project is located in a commercial/industrial area with the nearest residence located 530 feet from the project site. Existing night lighting in the area is generally of parking lots and for security purposes around buildings. A lighting plan has not been provided for the proposed project, however lighting is anticipated for security purposes. Additionally, interior lighting of residences would be visible from offsite. New exterior lighting would be required to comply with the requirements of the City's Outdoor Lighting and Design Ordinance (SBMC§22.75), which limits exterior lighting placement, height, and requires that lighting be hooded and directed so that it is not directed offsite. Compliance with this ordinance as enforced by ABR review of the lighting plan would ensure that exterior lighting does not result in a significant impact. Spillover of interior lighting would adversely increase lighting of the night sky in the area, however, due to the absence of nearby residential development in the immediate area. This impact is considered adverse but less than significant.

Visual Aesthetics – Recommended Mitigation

A-1 **Design Review.** Prior to building permit issuance, proposed project grading and landform alteration, structural design, landscaping, and lighting is subject to preliminary and final review and approval by the Architectural Board of Review for consistency with design guidelines for views, visual aesthetics and compatibility, and lighting.

A-2 **Lighting.** Lighting design shall conform with City Lighting Ordinance requirements, including shielding and direction to the ground to avoid off-site lighting and glare effects, and shall be approved by the Architectural Board of Review.

Visual Aesthetics - Residual Impacts

Project impacts to visual resources and aesthetics would be less than significant and would be further reduced with implementation of the measures identified above.

2. AIR QUALITY Could the project:		**NO**	**YES** ***Level of Significance***
a)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
b)	Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
c)	Create objectionable odors?		Less than Significant
Is the project consistent with the County of Santa Barbara Air Quality Attainment Plan? Yes			

Air Quality - Discussion

Issues. Air quality issues involve pollutant emissions from vehicle exhaust and industrial or other stationary sources that contribute to smog, particulates and nuisance dust associated with grading and construction processes, and nuisance odors.

Smog, or ozone, is formed in the atmosphere through a series of photochemical reactions involving interaction of oxides of nitrogen [NO_x] and reactive organic compounds [ROC] (referred to as ozone precursors) with sunlight over a period of several hours. Primary sources of ozone precursors in the South Coast area are vehicle emissions. Sources of particulate matter (PM_{10}) include demolition, grading, road dust, and vehicle exhaust, as well as agricultural tilling and mineral quarries.

The City of Santa Barbara is part of the South Coast Air Basin. The City is subject to the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), which are more stringent than the national standards, for six pollutants: photochemical ozone, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter, and lead. The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) provides oversight on compliance with air quality standards and preparation of the County Clean Air Plan. Presently, the County of Santa Barbara is in non-attainment with the CAAQS for ozone (O_3) and particulate matter (PM_{10}). An area is in nonattainment for a pollutant if the applicable CAAQS for that pollutant has been exceeded more than once in three years. There are also heavily congested intersections within the City that may approach the California 1-hour standard of 20 parts per million for carbon monoxide (CO) during peak traffic hours.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines. A project may create a significant air quality impact from the following:

- Exceeding an APCD pollutant threshold; inconsistency with District regulations; or exceeding population forecasts in the adopted County Clean Air Plan.
- Exposing sensitive receptors, such as children, the elderly or sick people to substantial pollutant exposure.
- Substantial unmitigated nuisance dust during earthwork or construction operations.
- Creation of nuisance odors inconsistent with APCD regulations.

Long-Term (Operational) Impact Guidelines: The City of Santa Barbara uses the SBCAPCD thresholds of significance for evaluating air quality impacts. The APCD has determined that a proposed project will not have a significant air quality impact on the environment if operation of the project will:

- Emit (from all project sources, both stationary and mobile) less than 240 pounds per day for ROC and NO_x , and 80 pounds per day for $PM_{10;}$
- Emit less than 25 pounds per day of ROC or NO_x from motor vehicle trips only;
- For CO, contribute less than 800 peak hour trips to an individual intersection;
- Not cause a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality Standard (except ozone); and not exceed the APCD health risks public notification thresholds adopted by the APCD Board; and
- Be consistent with the adopted federal and state air quality plans for Santa Barbara.

Short-Term (Construction) Impacts Guidelines***:*** Projects involving grading, paving, construction, and landscaping activities may cause localized nuisance dust impacts and increased particulate matter (PM_{10}). Substantial dust-related impacts may be potentially significant, but are generally considered mitigable with the application of standard dust control mitigation measures. Standard dust mitigation measures are applied to projects with either significant or less than significant effects.

Exhaust from construction equipment also contributes to air pollution. As a guideline, SBCAPCD Rule 202.F.3 identifies a substantial effect associated with projects having combined emissions from all construction equipment that exceed 25 tons of any pollutant (except carbon monoxide) within a 12-month period.

Cumulative Impacts and Consistency with Clean Air Plan: If the project-specific impact exceeds the significance threshold, it is also considered to have a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts. When a project is not accounted for in the most recent Clean Air Plan growth projections, then the project's impact may also be considered to have a considerable contribution to cumulative air quality impacts. The Santa Barbara County Association of Governments and Air Resources Board on-road emissions forecasts are used as a basis for vehicle emission forecasting. If a project provides for increased population growth beyond that forecasted in the most recently adopted CAP, or if the project does not incorporate appropriate air quality mitigation and control measures, or is inconsistent with APCD rules and regulations, then the project may be found inconsistent with the CAP and may have a significant impact on air quality.

Air Quality – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

2.a-b) Air Pollutant Emissions

Long-Term (Operational) Emissions: Long-term project air pollutant emissions primarily stem from motor vehicles associated with a project and/or from stationary sources that may require permits from the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD). The proposed project would not contain any stationary sources that require permits from APCD, as the General Industrial uses permitted are limited to those that do not emit odor, dust, gas, fumes, smoke, liquids, or wastes. The proposed project would result in approximately 281 new average daily trips (ADTs) and 21 AM and 25 PM peak-hour trips. Because the proposed project would generate less than 800 peak hour trips to an existing congested intersection, CO impacts are considered less than significant. Utilizing the URBEMIS 8.7 computer model, it is estimated that the proposed project would generate 6.29 pounds per day of NOx and 4.32 pounds per day of ROC, well below the established threshold of significance. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less than significant long-term air quality impact.

Short-Term (Construction) Emissions: The project would involve grading, transport of soils from the site, paving and landscaping activities which could cause localized dust related impacts resulting in increases in particulate matter (PM10). Dust-related impacts are considered potentially significant, but mitigable with the application of standard dust control mitigation measures.

Construction equipment would also emit NOx and ROC emissions. Based on the limited size of the proposed project, and the limited duration for proposed construction activities, emissions of NOx and ROC would be less than significant. Recommended mitigation measures requiring the use of ultra low sulphur diesel fuel and diesel particulate filters for all construction equipment would further minimize construction related emissions.

Sensitive Receptors: Sensitive receptors are defined as children, elderly or ill people that can be more adversely affected by air quality problems. Land uses typically associated with sensitive receptors include schools, parks, playgrounds, childcare centers, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals, and clinics. Stationary sources are of particular concern to sensitive receptors, as is construction dust and particulate matter. The proposed project does not include stationary sources, however, construction dust and particulates could affect children that use the school and after-school facilities at La Casa de la Raza. Impacts associated with nuisance dust and particulates are considered potentially significant, mitigable through application of dust control mitigation measures. The insignificant amounts of these pollutants would result in an insignificant exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutants.

2.c) Odors

The project would not contain features with the potential to emit substantial odorous emissions, from sources such as commercial cooking equipment, combustion or evaporation of fuels, sewer systems, or solvents and surface coatings. Due to the nature of the proposed land use and limited size of the project, project impacts related to odors are considered less than significant.

Consistency with the Clean Air Plan:

Direct and indirect emissions associated with the project are accounted for in the CAP emissions growth assumptions. Appropriate air quality mitigation measures, including construction dust suppression, would be applied to the project, consistent with CAP and City policies. The project can be found consistent with the Clean Air Plan.

Air Quality – Required Mitigation

AQ-1 Construction Dust Control – Minimize Disturbed Area/Speed. Minimize amount of disturbed area and reduce on site vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour or less.

AQ-2 Construction Dust Control - Watering. During site grading and transportation of fill materials, regular water sprinkling shall occur using reclaimed water whenever the Public Works Director determines that it is reasonably available. During clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation, sufficient quantities of water, through use of either water trucks or sprinkler systems, shall be applied to prevent dust from leaving the site. Each day, after construction activities cease, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be sufficiently moistened to create a crust.

Throughout construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall also be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust raised from leaving the site. At a minimum, this will include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency will be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph.

AQ-3 Construction Dust Control – Tarping. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be covered from the point of origin.

AQ-4 Construction Dust Control – Gravel Pads. Gravel pads shall be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud on to public roads.

AQ-5 Construction Dust Control – Stockpiling. If importation, exportation and stockpiling of fill material are involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.

AQ-6 Construction Dust Control – Disturbed Area Treatment. After clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation is completed, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated to prevent wind pickup of soil. This may be accomplished by:

A. Seeding and watering until grass cover is grown;

B. Spreading soil binders;

C. Sufficiently wetting the area down to form a crust on the surface with repeated soakings as necessary to maintain the crust and prevent dust pickup by the wind;

D. Other methods approved in advance by the Air Pollution Control District.

AQ-7 **Construction Dust Control – Paving.** All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc., shall be paved as soon as possible. Additionally, building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

AQ-8 **Construction Dust Control – PEC.** The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when construction work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the Air Pollution Control District prior to land use clearance for map recordation and land use clearance for finish grading for the structure.

Air Quality – Recommended Mitigation

The following shall be adhered to during project grading and construction to reduce NOx and PM2.5 emissions from construction equipment:

AQ-9 Heavy-duty diesel-powered construction equipment manufactured after 1996 (with federally mandated "clean" diesel engines) shall be utilized wherever feasible.

AQ-10 The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.

AQ-11 The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.

AQ-12 Construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications.

AQ-13 Construction equipment operating onsite shall be equipped with two to four degree engine timing retard or pre-combustion chamber engines.

AQ-14 Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.

AQ-15 Diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts and diesel particulate filters as certified and/or verified by EPA or California shall be installed, if available.

AQ-16 Diesel powered equipment shall be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.

AQ-17 To the maximum extent feasible, ultra low sulphur fuel or biodiesel shall be used for all construction equipment.

AQ-18 Idling of heavy-duty diesel trucks during loading and unloading shall be limited to five minutes; auxiliary power units shall be used whenever possible.

Air Quality - Residual Impacts

Implementation of the identified mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant short-term construction related impacts to air quality to a less than significant level and further reduce already less than significant short-term construction related impacts.

3. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Could the project result in impacts to:		NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a)	Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?	X	
b)	Locally designated historic, Landmark or specimen trees?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
c)	Natural communities (e.g. oak woodland, coastal habitat, etc.).	X	
d)	Wetland habitat (e.g. marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)?	X	
e)	Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?	X	

Biological Resources - Discussion

Issues: Biological resources issues involve the potential for a project to substantially affect biologically-important natural vegetation and wildlife, particularly species that are protected as rare, threatened, or endangered by federal or state wildlife agencies and their habitat, native specimen trees, and designated landmark or historic trees.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Existing native wildlife and vegetation on a project site are qualitatively assessed to identify whether they constitute important biological resources, based on the types, amounts, and quality of the resources within the context of the larger ecological community. If important biological resources exist, project effects to the resources are qualitatively evaluated to determine whether the project would substantially affect these important biological resources. Significant biological resource impacts may potentially result from substantial disturbance to important wildlife and vegetation in the following ways:

- Elimination or substantial reduction or disruption of important natural vegetative communities and wildlife habitat or migration corridors, such as oak woodland, coastal strand, riparian, and wetlands.
- Substantial effect on protected plant or animal species listed or otherwise identified or protected as endangered, threatened or rare.
- Substantial loss or damage to important native specimen trees or designated landmark or historic trees.

Biological Resources – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

3.a,b,d,e) Native Wildlife and Habitat

As recognized by the City of Santa Barbara Master Environmental Assessment, this portion of the City is almost entirely urbanized, and biological resources are limited. Vegetation on the project site is characterized by non-native specimen trees and non-native annual understory. No endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats currently listed nor candidates for State or Federal protection are present at this site. The project site does not support any contiguous natural communities nor function as an important wildlife movement or dispersal area. The proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to these resources, their habitats or wildlife movement opportunities. Project impacts to biological resources would be less than significant.

The vegetation onsite does not provide any habitat value beyond occasional nectar gathering for avian and invertebrates. No impacts are anticipated.

3.c) Specimen Trees

Mature native and non-native specimen trees provide numerous benefits to the environment, including visual beauty, shade, soil stability, air quality, and localized habitat for urban-adapted wildlife species, such as birds. City policies address the protection and replacement of mature trees.

Eleven specimen trees are to be removed. These include seven eucalyptus trees, two palms, one sycamore and one magnolia. The five eucalyptus trees along the northern property line and the eucalyptus tree near the corner of the project site are significant skyline trees. A total of 123 new trees are proposed. The preliminary landscape plan includes enhanced street tree planting and new canopy, accent and upright trees throughout the site. Replacement skyline trees include Lemon Gums, Paperbarks and California Sycamores. The removal of these skyline specimen trees is considered a

potentially significant impact, but mitigable with the installation of replacement skyline trees.

No locally designated historic or landmark trees exist on the project site.

Biological Resources – Mitigation

B-1 **Skyline Tree Replacement.** The preliminary landscape plan, which includes replacement skyline trees, shall be submitted to the ABR for review and approval. The approved landscaping shall be maintained for the life of the project.

Biological Resources - Residual Impacts

Implementation of the identified mitigation measure would reduce impacts to skyline trees to a less than significant level.

4. CULTURAL RESOURCES Could the project:		**NO**	**YES** ***Level of Significance***
a)	Disturb archaeological resources?	X	
b)	Affect a historic structure or site designated or eligible for designation as a National, State or City landmark?	X	
c)	Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect ethnic cultural values or restrict religious uses in the project area?	X	

Cultural Resources - Discussion

Issues: Archaeological resources are subsurface deposits dating from Prehistoric or Historical time periods. Native American culture appeared along the channel coast over 10,000 years ago, and numerous villages of the Barbareno Chumash flourished in coastal plains now encompassed by the City. Spanish explorers and eventual settlements in Santa Barbara occurred in the 1500's through 1700's. In the mid-1800's, the City began its transition from Mexican village to American city, and in the late 1800's through early 1900's experienced intensive urbanization. Historic resources are above-ground structures and sites from historical time periods with historic, architectural, or other cultural importance. The City's built environment has a rich cultural heritage with a variety of architectural styles, including the Spanish Colonial Revival style emphasized in the rebuilding of Santa Barbara's downtown following a destructive 1925 earthquake.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Archaeological and historical impacts are evaluated qualitatively by archeologists and historians. First, existing conditions on a site are assessed to identify whether important or unique archaeological or historical resources exist, based on criteria specified in the State CEQA *Guidelines* and City Master Environmental Assessment *Guidelines for Archaeological Resources and Historical Structures and Sites*, summarized as follows:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there exists a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- Is directly associated with an important prehistoric or historic event or person.

If important archaeological or historic resources exist on the site, project changes are evaluated to determine whether they would substantially affect these important resources.

Cultural Resources – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

4.a) Archaeological Resources

The project site is located within a prehistoric watercourse area and thus considered to have the potential for archaeological resources to be present. A Phase I Archaeological Resources Report was prepared and accepted by the Historic Landmarks Commission in 1989. No resources were identified onsite and the report concluded that no further analysis or monitoring during construction was required.

4.b) Historic Resources

The project site is currently vacant. Previously existing structures on the site were considered to have historic merit. The structures were demolished by a previous property owner. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

4.c) Ethnic/Religious Resources

There is no evidence that the site involves any ethnic or religious use or importance. The project would have no impact on historic, ethnic or religious resources.

Cultural Resources – Required Mitigation

CR-1 Discovery Procedures and Mitigation. Standard discovery measures shall be implemented per the City Master Environmental Assessment throughout grading and construction:

Prior to the start of any vegetation or paving removal, demolition, trenching or grading, contractors and construction personnel shall be alerted to the possibility of uncovering unanticipated subsurface archaeological features or artifacts.

If during any grading or construction on the site such archaeological resources are encountered or suspected, work shall be halted immediately, the City Environmental Analyst shall be notified and a City-approved archaeologist shall be employed to assess the nature, extent and significance of any discoveries and to develop appropriate management recommendations for archaeological resource treatment, including but not limited to redirection of grading and/or excavation activities. If the findings are potentially significant, further analysis and/or other mitigation shall be prepared and accepted by the Environmental Analyst and the Historic Landmarks Commission, and implemented by the project Work in the area may only proceed after the Environmental Analyst grants authorization.

If prehistoric or other Native American remains are encountered, a Native American representative shall be consulted, and the archaeologist and Native American representative shall monitor all further subsurface disturbances in the area of the find.

If the discovery consists of potentially human remains, the Santa Barbara County Coroner and the California Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted.

Residual Impacts:

None. The above measure would ensure consistency with policies requiring protection of archaeological resources.

5. GEOPHYSICAL CONDITIONS Could the project result in or expose people to:		***NO***	***YES*** ***Level of Significance***
a)	Seismicity: fault rupture?	X	
b)	Seismicity: ground shaking or liquefaction?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
c)	Seismicity: seiche or tsunami?		Less than Significant
d)	Landslides or mudslides?	X	
e)	Subsidence of the land?		Less than Significant
f)	Expansive soils?	X	
g)	Excessive grading or permanent changes in the topography?		Less than Significant

Geophysical Conditions - Discussion

Issues: Geophysical impacts involve geologic and soil conditions and their potential to create physical hazards affecting persons or property; or substantial changes to the physical condition of the site. Included are earthquake-related conditions such as fault rupture, ground-shaking, liquefaction (a condition in which saturated soil looses shear strength during earthquake shaking); or seismic sea waves; unstable soil or slope conditions, such as landslides, subsidence, expansive or compressible/collapsible soils; or erosion; and extensive grading or topographic changes.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Potentially significant geophysical impacts may result from:

- Exposure to or creation of unstable earth conditions due to seismic conditions, such as earthquake faulting, groundshaking, liquefaction, or seismic waves.
- Exposure to or creation of unstable earth conditions due to geologic or soil conditions, such as landslides, settlement, or expansive, collapsible/compressible, or expansive soils.
- Extensive grading on slopes exceeding 20%, substantial topographic change, destruction of unique physical features; substantial erosion of soils, overburden, or sedimentation of a water course.

Geophysical Conditions – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

The discussion of existing conditions is based upon the Geotechnical Engineering Report dated December 8, 2006 prepared by Fugro West, Inc. (see Exhibit E).

5.a-c) Seismic Hazards

Fault Rupture: The nearest mapped fault is located over ½ mile from the project site. Fault rupture as a result of a seismic event is not anticipated. No fault rupture impacts are anticipated.

Ground Shaking and Liquefaction: The project site is located in a seismically active area of southern California. Significant ground shaking as a result of a local or regional earthquake is likely to occur during the life of the project. Due to the presence of groundwater and loose to medium dense silty sand, the site is considered to be susceptible to liquefaction in the event of a strong earthquake. Future development would be required to comply with building code requirements that would minimize potential hazards associated with ground shaking. The Geotechnical Engineering Report also recommends design components to address liquefaction hazards. These include the use of vibro-replacement stone columns, compaction grouting, deep compaction and/or use of geopiers. These geologic hazards are considered potentially significant impacts, but mitigable with the implementation of the recommendations in the above-referenced report.

Seiche or Tsunami: The project site is located within the tsunami run-up zone as identified in the City's Master Environmental Assessment. The proposed project consists of new infill development and would not substantially change the level of public exposure nor result in increased tsunami risks beyond existing levels. Impacts are considered less than significant.

The project site is not subject to seiche hazards.

5.d-f) Geologic or Soil Instability

Landslides: The project site topography is flat and would not be subject to landslide hazards.

Subsidence: The potential for subsidence on the site is considered low, and impacts are considered less than significant. Further, recommendations in the Geotechnical Engineering Report include overexcavation and replacement of soils such that any risk from subsidence would be substantially reduced.

Expansive Soils: As shown on the City's MEA and documented in the Geotechnical Engineering Report, the site is not subject to expansive soils or soil creep.

5.g) Topography; Grading

Grading: Site grading and preparation would include excavation and replacement of artificial fill. The amount of earthwork required for site preparation is estimated to be approximately 260 cubic yards of cut and 2,060 cubic yards of fill. Dewatering of over excavated materials is also anticipated. Finish grading would result in raising the existing grade by 1-2 feet to address flood hazards. The proposed grading would not result in a significant alteration of the natural landform or substantially change the existing topography of the site. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Geophysical Conditions - Mitigation

G-1 Geotechnical Requirements. Site preparation and project construction related to soil conditions and seismic hazards shall be in accordance with the recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by Fugro West, Inc., dated December 8, 2006 Compliance shall be demonstrated on plans submitted for grading and building permits.

Geophysical Conditions – Residual Impacts

Implementation of the required site preparation and structural design measures would mitigate potential geologic hazards to less than significant levels.

6. HAZARDS		NO	YES
	Could the project involve:		***Level of Significance***
a)	A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?		Less than Significant
b)	The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazards?		Less than Significant
c)	Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?		Less than Significant
d)	Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?		Less than Significant

Hazards - Discussion

Issues: Hazardous materials issues involve the potential for public health or safety impacts from exposure of persons or the environment to hazardous materials or risk of accidents involving combustible or toxic substances.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Significant impacts may result from the following:

- Siting of incompatible projects in close proximity to existing sources of safety risk, such as pipelines, industrial processes, railroads, airports, etc.
- Exposure of project occupants or construction workers to unremediated soil or groundwater contamination.
- Exposure of persons or the environment to hazardous substances due to improper use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- Siting of development in a high fire hazard areas or beyond adequate emergency response time, with inadequate access or water pressure, or otherwise in a manner that creates a fire hazard

Hazards – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

6.a,b,c) Public Health and Safety

Hazardous Materials and Safety Risks:

Contaminated Soils/Groundwater: The presence of groundwater contaminated with chlorinated solvents on the project site resulted in cleanup activities in the late 1990's that were overseen by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (CRWQCB). Cleanup to Basin Plan levels was completed in 1999 and the site was officially closed by the CRWQCB. The CRWQCB currently oversees groundwater monitoring and cleanup activities for sites at 619 E. Montecito Street and 320 Nopal Street. The Fire Prevention Division (FPD) of the Santa Barbara County Fire Department oversees cleanup of Leaking Underground Fuel Tanks (LUFT). There are five LUFT sites in the project vicinity. FPD has determined that there is no evidence that petroleum hydrocarbons or associated contamination has migrated under the project site. However, FPD noted the potential for a dissolved-phase plume of chlorinated hydrocarbons from 320 Nopal Street to have migrated beneath the project site.

In order to evaluate whether chlorinated hydrocarbon contamination had migrated under the site, FPD required that a soil gas survey be conducted at the project site. That work was completed and has been documented in a report prepared by Padre Associates, dated April 2006 (see Exhibit F).

Padre concluded that no significant health risk is associated with the detected concentration of TCA found in the soil vapor onsite and that the site is suitable for residential development with respect to VOCs in the near surface soils. These results have been reviewed and accepted by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department as stated in the letters dated May 3 and July 20, 2006 (see Exhibit G). No further investigation is required and impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Exposure of Residents to and Risk from Hazardous Materials. The project site is located within an area zoned M-1 which permits light manufacturing uses that may involve the use, storage or production of hazardous materials. Current uses on adjacent properties are primarily office but include a machine shop and light industrial uses. The proposed use is residential which would not involve the use, storage or production of substantial amounts of hazardous materials. Any

such use on the project site or in the project vicinity would be subject to all applicable State and local requirements for management and disposals of such materials. Therefore, the impacts to residents are considered less than significant.

6.d) Fire Hazard

The project site is not located in a City designated high fire hazard area. The existing site conditions include 11 specimen trees and non-native understory. Existing vegetation would be replaced with building and limited ornamental landscaping. The project would be subject to Fire Department and City Ordinance requirements for adequate access, structural design and materials and onsite water for fire protection. Adherence to the standard requirements of the Uniform Fire Code with respect to building design would ensure that fire hazard impacts for the proposed project would be less than significant.

Hazards - Mitigation

None required.

Hazards – Residual Impacts

Compliance with State and local requirements for management and disposal of hazardous materials would ensure hazardous wastes impacts of the proposed project are less than significant.

7. NOISE Could the project result in:		**NO**	**YES** ***Level of Significance***
a)	Increases in existing noise levels?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
b)	Exposure of people to severe noise levels?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable

Noise - Discussion

Issues: Noise issues are associated with siting of a new noise-sensitive land use in an area subject to high ambient background noise levels, siting of a noise-generating land use next to existing noise-sensitive land uses, and/or short-term construction-related noise.

The primary source of ambient noise in the City is vehicle traffic noise. The City Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) *Noise Contour Map* identifies average ambient noise levels within the City.

Ambient noise levels are determined as averaged 24-hour weighted levels, using the Day-Night Noise Level (L_{dn}) or Community Noise Equivalence Level (CNEL) measurement scales. The L_{dn} averages the varying sound levels occurring over the 24-hour day and gives a 10 decibel penalty to noises occurring between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. to take into account the greater annoyance of intrusive noise levels during nighttime hours. Since L_{dn} is a 24-hour average noise level, an area could have sporadic loud noise levels above 60 dB(A) which average out over the 24-hour period. CNEL is similar to L_{dn} but includes a separate 5 dB(A) penalty for noise occurring between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. CNEL and L_{dn} values usually agree with one another within 1 dB(A). The Equivalent Noise Level (L_{eq}) is a single noise level, which, if held constant during the measurement time period, would represent the same total energy as a fluctuating noise. L_{eq} values are commonly expressed for periods of one hour, but longer or shorter time periods may be specified. In general, a change in noise level of less than three decibels is not audible. A doubling of the distance from a noise source will generally equate to a change in decibel level of six decibels.

Guidance for appropriate long-term background noise levels for various land uses are established in the City General Plan Noise Element Land Use Compatibility Guidelines. Building codes also establish maximum average ambient noise levels for the interiors of structures.

High construction noise levels occur with the use of heavy equipment such as scrapers, rollers, graders, trenchers and large trucks for demolition, grading, and construction. Equipment noise levels can vary substantially through a construction period, and depend on the type of equipment, number of pieces operating, and equipment maintenance. Construction equipment generates noise levels of more than 80 or 90 dB(A) at a distance of 50 feet, and the shorter impulsive noises from other construction equipment (such as pile drivers and drills) can be even higher, up to and exceeding 100 dB(A). Noise during construction is generally intermittent and sporadic, and after completion of the initial demolition, grading and site preparation activities, tends to be quieter.

The Noise Ordinance (Chapter 9.16 of the Santa Barbara Municipal Code) governs short-term or periodic noise, such as construction noise, operation of motorized equipment or amplified sound, or other sources of nuisance noise. The ordinance establishes limitations on hours of construction and motorized equipment operations, and provides criteria for defining nuisance noise in general.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: A significant noise impact may result from:

- Siting of a project such that persons would be subject to long-term ambient noise levels in excess of Noise Element land use compatibility guidelines as follows
    - Residential: Normally acceptable maximum exterior ambient noise level of 60 dB(A); maximum interior noise level of 45 dB(A).
    - Schools: Normally acceptable maximum exterior ambient noise level of 65 dB(A); maximum interior noise level of 45 db(A).
    - Office Buildings: Normally acceptable maximum exterior ambient noise level of 75 dB(A); maximum interior noise level of 50 db(A).
    - Commercial - Wholesale: Normally acceptable maximum exterior ambient noise level of 80 dB(A).
- Substantial noise from grading and construction activity in close proximity to noise-sensitive receptors for an extensive duration.

Noise – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

7.a-b) Increased Noise Level; Exposure to High Noise Levels

Long-Term Operational Noise:

The project site is located in an area subject to average ambient noise levels from roadway noise of 65-70 dBA, as shown on the City's Master Environmental Assessment noise contour maps. A Community Noise Analysis, dated February 2007, was prepared by URS Corporation (see Exhibit H).

Exterior Noise Levels – The proposed project meets the outdoor living space requirement by providing at least fifteen percent (15%) of the total lot area as common open yard area. The Community Noise Analysis report indicates that the noise levels for these proposed common open yard areas would be below 55 dB(A) (Ldn), which is well below the City of Santa Barbara threshold of 60 dB(A). Therefore, exterior noise levels are considered less than significant.

Interior Noise Levels – The Community Noise Analysis report indicates that, for most residential units, it should be possible to achieve compliance with the 45 dBA interior noise standard without any special architectural or structural designs. However, for those residential units exposed to exterior Ldn values above 60 dBA, it may be necessary to keep windows and exterior doors closed. For these units, forced air circulation must be provided. The affected units, identified in the report, are those fronting or facing E. Montecito Street, adjacent to Calle Cesar Chavez and adjacent to the western project boundary. Interior noise levels are considered potentially significant, but mitigable with the implementation of the requirement that forced air circulation must be provided for these units.

Temporary Construction Noise:

Uses around the project site are primarily light industrial and office. These uses are not considered noise sensitive. The closest residences are located approximately 530 feet from the project site on Quarantina Street. La Casa de la Raza, a community center facility, is located across Calle Cesar Chavez. La Casa de la Raza includes a youth center where educational activities are conducted, including morning classes for junior high and high school students and an after school program for elementary and junior high students. Classroom windows are located along Calle Cesar Chavez, opposite the project site. The building has a ventilation system. The identified educational uses are considered noise sensitive.

Noise from grading and construction equipment, pile driving, truck traffic and vibration would affect surrounding noise-sensitive uses during the 18 month construction period. Project grading and site preparation are anticipated to last three months and is anticipated to be the noisiest phase of construction. Building construction would require an additional 15 months. The Noise Analysis estimates earth moving noise levels at 80-90 dBA at 50 feet. Noise levels associated with pile driving are similar to other construction noise levels but are impulsive and thus more noticeable and intrusive. Pile driving is expected to last for a period of two weeks. The applicant has requested the ability to commence construction at 7 am on weekdays, which would result in a decrease in the amount of days required to complete the construction. As sensitive receptors would be subject to construction noise levels in excess of 80 dBA for a period not anticipated to

exceed three months. To the degree feasible, mitigation is required to provide advance notice of construction, limit construction during the most sensitive times, and to provide sound control of equipment and barriers. Impacts are considered adverse but not significant.

Noise - Mitigation

N-1 **Construction Notice.** At least 30 days prior to commencement of construction, the contractor shall provide written notice to all property owners and building occupants within 450 feet of the project area. Notice to Casa de la Raza shall be provided 90 days prior to the commencement of construction. The notice shall contain a description of the proposed project, a construction schedule including days and hours of construction, the name and phone number of the Project Environmental Coordinator (PEC) who can answer questions, and provide additional information or address problems that may arise during construction. A 24-hour construction hot line shall be provided. Informational signs with the PEC's name and telephone number shall also be posted at the site.

N-2: **Construction Hours.** Noise-generating construction activities (which may include preparation for construction work) shall be permitted weekdays between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., excluding holidays observed by the City as legal holidays: New Year's Day (January 1st); Martin Luther King Jr.'s Birthday (3rd Monday in January); President's Day (3rd Monday in February); Memorial Day (Last Monday in May); Independence Day (July 4th); Labor Day (1st Monday in September); Thanksgiving Day (4th Thursday in November); Day Following Thanksgiving Day (Friday following Thanksgiving); Christmas Day (December 25th). *When a holiday falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the preceding Friday or following Monday respectively shall be observed as a legal holiday.

Occasional night work may be approved for the hours between 5 p.m. and 8 a.m. weekdays by the Chief of Building and Zoning per Section 9.13.015 of the Municipal Code). In the event of such night work approval, the applicant shall provide written notice to all property owners and occupants within 450 feet of the project property boundary and the City Planning and Building Divisions at least 48 hours prior to commencement of night work. Night work shall not be permitted on weekends and holidays.

N-3: **Construction Equipment Sound Control.** All construction equipment, including trucks, shall be professionally maintained and fitted with standard manufacturers' muffler and silencing devices.

N-4 **Sound Barriers During Construction.** As part of the building plan submittal, prepare and submit a sound control plan including devices and techniques such as noise shields and blankets in order to reduce noise impacts to surrounding sensitive noise receptors during construction.

N-5 **Noise Reduction**. As recommended in the Community Noise Analysis prepared by URS Corporation , dated February 2007, a ventilation system shall be installed for all units expected to be exposed to exterior noise levels above 60 dBA in the future (at least 2016). Ventilation systems shall be installed and operable prior to Certificate of Occupancy.

Noise – Residual Impact

Implementation of the identified mitigation measures would reduce operational noise impacts to a less than significant level. Adverse but not significant construction noise impacts would be minimized by the identified mitigation measures.

8. POPULATION AND HOUSING Could the project:		**NO**	**YES** **Level of Significance**
a)	Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?		Less than Significant
b)	Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	X	

Population and Housing - Discussion

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Issues of potentially significant population and housing impacts may involve:

- Growth inducement, such as provision of substantial population or employment growth or creation of substantial housing demand; development in an undeveloped area, or extension/ expansion of major infrastructure that could support additional future growth.

- Loss of a substantial number of housing units, especially loss of more affordable housing.

Population and Housing – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

8.a) Growth-Inducing Impacts

The project site is located in an existing developed urban area already served by urban infrastructure. No extensions of infrastructure or urban services would be necessary to serve the project site. The proposed residential units are intended to meet existing demand for ownership housing units within the community and would not induce growth. Growth inducing impacts as a result of the project would be less than significant.

8.b) Housing Displacement

The project would not involve any housing displacement. No impact would result from the project.

Population and Housing - Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Population and Housing – Residual Impact

Impacts would be less than significant.

9. PUBLIC SERVICES Could the project have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered services in any of the following areas:		**NO**	**YES** ***Level of Significance***
a)	Fire protection?		Less than Significant
b)	Police protection?		Less than Significant
c)	Schools?		Less than Significant
d)	Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?		Less than Significant
e)	Other governmental services?		Less than Significant
f)	Electrical power or natural gas?		Less than Significant
g)	Water treatment or distribution facilities?		Less than Significant
h)	Sewer or septic tanks?		Less than Significant
i)	Water distribution/demand?		Less than Significant
j)	Solid waste disposal?		Less than Significant

Public Services - Discussion

Issues: This section evaluates project effects on fire and police protection services, schools, road maintenance and other governmental services, utilities, including electric and natural gas, water and sewer service, and solid waste disposal.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: The following may be identified as significant public services and facilities impacts:

- Creation of a substantial need for increased police department, fire department, road maintenance, or government services staff or equipment.
- Generation of substantial numbers of students exceeding public school capacity where schools have been designated as overcrowded.
- Inadequate water, sewage disposal, or utility facilities.
- Substantial increase in solid waste disposal to area sanitary landfills.

Public Services – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

9a-b,d-g. Facilities and Services

The project site is located in an urban area where all public services are available. In 2005, the City prepared a General Plan Update: 2030 Condition, Trends, and Issues Report (September 2005) that examined existing conditions associated with fire protection, police protection, library services, public facilities, governmental facilities, electrical power, and natural gas. The CTI Report specifically analyzed whether there were deficiencies existing or anticipated for each of the public services. The CTI report determined that police and fire protection services, and library services are being provided at acceptable levels to the City. In addition, the CTI Report determined that electricity, natural gas, telephone, and cable telecommunication services are being provided at acceptable service levels and utility companies did not identify any deficiencies in providing service in the future. Finally, the CTI Report determined that demand for City buildings and facilities will continue to be impacted by growth, although no appropriate/acceptable levels of service have been established.

The project would be served with connections to existing public services for gas, electricity, cable, and telephone traversing the site, as well as access to existing roads. The project is not anticipated to create a substantially different demand on fire or police protection services, library services, or City buildings and facilities than that anticipated in the CTI Report. Therefore, impacts to fire protection, police protection, library services, City buildings and facilities, electrical power, natural gas, telephone, and cable telecommunication services are anticipated to be less than significant.

9.c) Schools

The project site is served by the Santa Barbara Elementary and High School Districts for elementary and high school. The project would provide an increase of 48 residential units, which could generate additional students.

None of the school districts in the South Coast have been designated "overcrowded" as defined by California State law. School impact fees would be applied to the project in accordance with State law. Project impacts to schools would be less than significant.

9.h,i) Water and Sewer

Water

The City of Santa Barbara's water supply comes from the following sources, with the actual share of each determined by availability and level of customer demand: Cachuma Reservoir and Tecolote Tunnel, Gibraltar Reservoir and Mission Tunnel, 300 Acre Feet per Year (AFY) of contractual transfer from Montecito Water district, groundwater, State Water Project entitlement, desalination, and recycled water. Conservation and efficiency improvements are projected to contribute to the supply by displacing demand that would otherwise have to be supplied by additional sources. In 1994, based on the comprehensive review of the City's water supply in the Long Term Water Supply Alternatives Analysis (LTWSAA), the City Council approved the Long Term Water Supply Program (LTWSP). The LTWSP outlines a strategy to use the above sources to meet the projected demand of 17,900 AFY (including 1,500 AFY of demand projected to be met with conservation) plus a 10 percent safety margin for a total of 19,700 AFY. Therefore, the target for the amount of water the system will actually have to supply, including the safety margin, is 18,200 AFY. The 2003 Water Supply Management Report documents an actual system demand of 13,460 AFY and a theoretical commitment of 16,170 AFY. Of the total system production, 95% was potable water and 5% was reclaimed water.

In 2005, the City prepared a General Plan Update: 2030 Condition, Trends, and Issues Report (September 2005) that examined existing conditions associated with water supply, treatment, and distribution system, and specifically analyzed and determined that there were no existing or anticipated deficiencies for the next 20-year planning period based on a growth rate of .7% per year.

The proposed project receives water service from the City of Santa Barbara. The proposed project is within the anticipated growth rate for the City and therefore, the City's long-term water supply and existing water treatment and distribution facilities would adequately serve the proposed project.

Because the site is currently vacant, the site demands zero (0) AFY of water. The proposed project is estimated to demand 10.56 AFY (based on the City's Water Demand Factor and Conservation Study "User's Guide" Document No. 2). Therefore, the change in water use would be approximately 10.56 AFY, which would not significantly impact the City's water supply.

The potential increase in demand from the proposed project would constitute a less than significant impact to the City water supply, treatment, and distribution facilities.

Sewer

The maximum capacity of the El Estero Treatment Plant is 11 million gallons per day, with current average daily flow 8.5 MGD. The Treatment Plant is designed to treat the wastewater from a population of 104,000. The proposed project's estimated net new sewer demand is 8,178 gallons per day or 9.16 AFY.

Increased sewage treatment associated by the project can be accommodated by the existing City sewer system and sewage treatment plant, and would represent a less than significant impact.

9.j) Solid Waste Generation/ Disposal

Most of the waste generated in the City is transported on a daily basis to seven landfills located around the County. The County of Santa Barbara, which operates the landfills, has developed impact significance thresholds related to the impacts of development on remaining landfill capacity. The County thresholds are based on the projected average solid waste generation for Santa Barbara County from 1990-2005. The County assumes a 1.2% annual increase (approximately 4000 tons per year) in solid waste generation over the 15-year period.

The County's threshold for project specific impacts to the solid waste system is 196 tons per year (this figure represents 5% of the expected average annual increase in solid waste generation [4000 tons/year]). Source reduction, recycling, and composting can reduce a project's waste stream by as much as 50%. If a proposed project generates 196 or more tons per year after reduction and recycling efforts, impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Proposed projects with a project specific impact as identified above (196 tons/year or more) would also be considered cumulatively significant, as the project specific threshold of significance is based on a cumulative growth scenario. However, as landfill space is already extremely limited, any increase in solid waste of 1% or more of the expected average annual increase in solid waste generation [4000 tons/year], which equates to 40 tons per year, is considered an adverse cumulative impact.

Long-Term (Operational). The project use is estimated to generate 120.84 tons per year of solid waste as follows:

Attached Residential: 2.65 people/ unit * 48 units * 0.95 tons/year = 120.84 tons/year

With application of source reduction, reuse, and recycling, landfill disposal of solid waste could be reduced to 60.42 TPY. The project specific impact is considered less than significant because the 196 TPY threshold is not exceeded, however, an adverse cumulative impact would result because waste generation would exceed 40 tons per year.

Short-Term (Demolition and Construction). Project grading would require some export of non-structural fill. Construction-related waste generation would be short-term and less than significant. Application of recommended standard mitigation to reduce, re-use, and recycle construction waste to the extent feasible would minimize this effect.

Public Services – Recommended Mitigation

PS-1 **Trash Enclosure Provision.** A trash enclosure with adequate area for recycling containers shall be provided on the Real Property and screened from view from surrounding properties and the street. Dumpsters and containers with a capacity of 1.5 cubic yards or more shall not be placed within five (5) feet of combustible walls, openings, or roofs, unless protected with fire sprinklers.

PS-2 **Demolition/Construction Materials Recycling.** Recycling and/or reuse of demolition/construction materials shall be carried out to the extent feasible, and containers shall be provided on site for that purpose, in order to minimize construction-generated waste conveyed to the landfill. Indicate on the plans the location of a container of sufficient size to handle the materials, subject to review and approval by the City Solid Waste Specialist, for collection of demolition/construction materials. A minimum of 90% of demolition and construction materials shall be recycled or reused. Evidence shall be submitted at each inspection to show that recycling and/or reuse goals are being met.

Public Services – Residual Impacts

Implementation of the identified mitigation measures would reduce cumulative solid waste impacts to less than significant levels. Short-term solid waste construction impacts would be less than significant and further reduced by the recommended mitigation measure.

10. RECREATION Could the project:		NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a)	Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?		Less than Significant
b)	Affect existing parks or other public recreational facilities?	X	

Recreation - Discussion

Issues: Recreational issues are associated with increased demand for recreational facilities, or loss or impacts to existing recreational facilities.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: Recreation impacts may be significant if they result in:

- Substantial increase in demand for park and recreation facilities in an area under-served by existing public park and recreation facilities.
- Substantial loss or interference with existing park space or other public recreational facilities such as hiking, cycling, or horse trails.

Recreation – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

10.a) Recreational Demand

Currently within the City there are more than 1,800 acres of natural open space, park land and other recreational facilities. In addition, there are 28 tennis courts, 2 public outdoor swimming pools, beach volleyball courts, sport fields, lawn bowling greens, a golf course, 13 community buildings and a major skateboard facility. The City also offers a wide variety of recreational programs for people of all ages and abilities in sports, various classes, tennis, aquatics and cultural arts.

In 2005, the City prepared a General Plan Update: 2030 Condition, Trends, and Issues Report (September 2005) (CTI Report) that examined existing conditions associated with recreation and parks. Population characteristics including income, age, population growth, education and ethnicity affect recreation interests and participation levels.

The CTI Report determined that there is an uneven distribution of parkland in the City, such that some areas of the City may currently be underserved with neighborhood parks, but overall the City has adequate passive, community, beach, regional, open space, and sports facility parks. .

The development of the proposed project with new residences would create an increase in the demand for park and recreational opportunities. As indicated above, the City of Santa Barbara has ample parkland, albeit unevenly distributed throughout the City, and adequate recreation facilities. The proposed project would introduce additional residents into the Lower East neighborhood where existing nearby parks include Ortega Park, Vera Cruz Park and Chase Palm Park. In this case, sufficient neighborhood and community parks are located within close proximity to the project site. Residents would also have access to other community, beach, regional, open space, and sports facility parks, and all City recreation programs. Therefore, the increase in park and recreational demands associated with the residences would be a less than significant impact.

10.b) Existing Recreational Facilities

The proposed project is nearby, but not immediately adjacent, to Ortega Park, Vera Cruz Park and Chase Palm Park. The proposed residential and light industrial uses by their nature and location would not interfere or cause a substantial loss of use by means of obnoxious or offensive emission of odors, dust, gas, fumes, smoke, liquids, wastes, noise, vibrations, disturbances, or other similar causes with existing parks or recreational facilities. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on recreational facilities.

Recreation - Mitigation

None required.

Recreation – Residual Impacts

Impacts are less than significant.

11. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION Could the project result in:		NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a)	Increased vehicle trips?		Potentially Significant
b)	Hazards to safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves, inadequate sight distance or dangerous intersections)?		Less than Significant
c)	Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?		Less than Significant
d)	Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?		Potentially Significant
e)	Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?		Less than Significant

Transportation - Discussion

Issues: Transportation issues include traffic, access, circulation, safety, and parking. Vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian, and transit modes of transportation are all considered, as well as emergency vehicle access. The City General Plan Circulation Element contains policies addressing circulation, traffic, and parking in the City.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: A proposed project may have a significant impact on traffic/ circulation/ parking if it would:

Vehicle Traffic

- Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and street system capacity (see traffic thresholds below).
- Cause insufficiency in transit system.
- Conflict with the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) or Circulation Element or other adopted plan or policy pertaining to vehicle or transit systems.

Circulation and Traffic Safety

- Create potential hazards due to addition of traffic to a roadway that has design features (e.g., narrow width, roadside ditches, sharp curves, poor sight distance, inadequate pavement structure) or that supports uses that would be incompatible with substantial increases in traffic.
- Diminish or reduce safe pedestrian and/or bicycle circulation.
- Result in inadequate emergency access on-site or to nearby uses.

Parking

- Result in insufficient parking capacity for the projected amount of automobiles and bicycles.

Traffic Thresholds of Significance: The City uses Levels of Service (LOS) "A" through "F" to describe operating conditions at signalized intersections in terms of volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios, with LOS A (0.50-0.60 V/C) representing free flowing conditions and LOS F (0.90+ V/C) describing conditions of substantial delay. The City General Plan Circulation Element establishes the goal for City intersections to not exceed LOS C (0.70-0.80 V/C).

For purposes of environmental assessment, LOS C at 0.77 V/C is the threshold Level of Service against which impacts are measured. An intersection is considered "impacted" if the volume to capacity ratio is .77 V/C or greater.

Project-Specific Significant Impact: A project-specific significant impact results when:

(a) Project peak-hour traffic would cause a signalized intersection to exceed 0.77 V/C, or

(b) The V/C of an intersection already exceeding 0.77 V/C would be increased by 0.01 (1%) or more as a result of project peak-hour traffic.

For non-signalized intersections, delay-time methodology is utilized in evaluating impacts.

Significant Cumulative Contribution: A project would result in a significant contribution to cumulative traffic impacts when:

(a) Project peak-hour traffic together with other cumulative traffic from existing and reasonably foreseeable pending projects would cause an intersection to exceed 0.77 V/C, or

(b) Project would contribute traffic to an intersection already exceeding 0.77 V/C.

Transportation – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

11.a) Traffic

Long-Term Traffic

A Traffic, Circulation and Parking Study was prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers, dated April 12, 2007 (see Exhibit I). The Study indicates that the proposed project would generate approximately 281 average daily trips (ADT) and 21 a.m. and 25 p.m. peak-hour trips (PHT). The Study further states that when distributed to the surrounding street system, these additional trips will travel through the impacted Garden St./ Gutierrez Street intersection, which has a Level of Service D. Therefore, the proposed project may cause a potentially significant project specific and/or cumulative impact which requires further analysis in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Short-Term Construction Traffic

The overall project construction process is estimated to last approximately 18 months. This would include grading for site preparation over approximately three months, and construction duration of estimated 15 months. Project construction would require approximately 50 workers on a typical day with a peak of 100 workers for some construction phases. Working hours during the construction process are proposed to be 7 a.m. – 5 p.m. weekdays excluding holidays, instead of the typical working hours of 8 a.m.-5 p.m. Staging, equipment, materials storage and temporary construction worker parking would occur onsite when feasible and offsite at an undetermined location.

The project would generate construction-related traffic that would occur over the 18 month construction period and would vary depending on the stage of construction. Temporary construction traffic is generally considered an adverse but not significant impact. Standard mitigation measures would be applied as appropriate, including restrictions on the hours permitted for construction trips and approval of routes for construction traffic. In this case, given the duration of the construction process and the potential for construction to overlap with Highway 101 ramp closures associated with the 101 operational improvements scheduled to commence in 2007. Short-term construction-related traffic may create a potentially significant impact, and will be further evaluated in the EIR.

11.b Access/Circulation

Access drives meeting minimum width standards of the Fire Department are proposed on Calle Cesar Chavez and Montecito Street. Adequate line of sight distance from these ingress/egress points has been provided. Traffic safety impacts of the project would be less than significant.

11.c Emergency Access

The Fire Department has reviewed the site plan for the proposed project and indicates that emergency vehicle maneuvering areas are adequate and access/distance from fire-fighting equipment to the proposed structures meets standards. Emergency access impacts of the project would be less than significant.

11.d. Parking

The proposed project includes 98 parking spaces. The Municipal Code parking requirement for the project is 96 spaces for the residential units and 12 guest spaces for a total of 108 spaces. The project would provide the required parking spaces for the residential units but would only provide two of the required guest parking spaces. The Traffic, Circulation and Parking Study included a parking survey to determine the visitor parking demand generated by the project. Between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., the demand was determined to be two spaces which would be accommodated by the two visitor spaces provided onsite. The Study further states that the project would not add to the on-street parking demand during this mid-day period when parking occupancies are highest, due to the higher demands generated by the adjacent commercial and office land uses.

The visitor parking demand would increase to between 7 and 12 spaces in the evening periods (6 p.m. – 8 p.m.) when the on-street parking occupancies are less than 50%, and there are lower on-street parking demands generated by the adjacent commercial and office land uses. The Study concludes that the proposed project would not generate impacts to the on-street parking resources in the study area. However, because City policy requires that the parking demand for the project be met onsite, the proposed project may cause a potentially significant parking impact both on and offsite which requires further analysis in an EIR.

11.e. Circulation Safety

The proposed project would not create any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists. Building entrances on Montecito Street and Calle Cesar Chavez are separated from vehicle access points. Therefore, impacts to circulation would be less than significant.

Transportation – Mitigation

The measures identified below are preliminary. Measures would be refined and augmented as a part of the project EIR.

T-1 **Construction Traffic.** The haul routes for all construction-related trucks, three tons or more, entering or exiting the site, shall be approved by the Transportation Engineer. Construction-related truck trips shall not be scheduled during peak hours (7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.) to help reduce truck traffic and noise on adjacent streets and roadways. The route of construction-related traffic shall be established to minimize trips through residential neighborhoods and minimize congestion.

T-2 **Construction Parking.** Construction parking and storage shall be provided as follows:

a. During construction, free parking spaces for construction workers and construction shall be provided on-site or off-site in a location subject to the approval of the Public Works Director. Construction workers are prohibited from parking within the public right-of-way, except as outlined in subparagraph b. below.

b. Parking in the public right of way is permitted as posted by Municipal Code, as reasonably allowed for in the 2006 Greenbook (or latest reference), and with a Public Works permit in restricted parking zones. No more than three (3) individual parking permits without extensions may be issued for the life of the project.

c. Storage or staging of construction materials and equipment within the public right-of-way shall not be permitted, unless approved by the Transportation Manager.

T-3 **Disabled Accessibility.** Project circulation shall provide for disabled accessibility or equivalent facilitation in accordance with American Disabilities Act requirements.

Transportation – Residual Impact

Potentially significant traffic and parking impacts and mitigation would be further analyzed in the EIR. Further information and discussion of traffic and parking impacts in the EIR would include the following:

- Discussion of existing and cumulative traffic levels of service for both surrounding signalized and non-signalized impacted intersections and freeway ramps and analysis of the effect of project trips.
- Cumulative effects of the project together with pending projects.
- Identification of mitigation measures to reduce operational and short-term construction impacts.
- Analysis of parking demand and supply onsite and on area streets, including identification of mitigation measures to address impacts.

12. WATER ENVIRONMENT Could the project result in:		NO	YES *Level of Significance*
a)	Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?		Less than Significant
b)	Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?		Less than Significant
c)	Discharge into surface waters?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
d)	Change in the quantity, quality, direction or rate of flow of ground waters?		Less than Significant
e)	Increased storm water drainage?		Less than Significant

Water – Discussion

Issues: Water resources issues include changes in offsite drainage and infiltration/groundwater recharge; storm water runoff and flooding; and water quality.

Impact Evaluation Guidelines: A significant impact would result from:

Water Resources and Drainage

- Substantially changing the amount of surface water in any water body or the quantity of groundwater recharge.
- Substantially changing the drainage pattern or creating a substantially increased amount or rate of surface water runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned drainage and storm water systems.

Flooding

- Locating development within 100-year flood hazard areas; substantially altering the course or flow of flood waters or otherwise exposing people or property to substantial flood hazard

Water Quality

- Substantial discharge of sediment or pollutants into surface water or groundwater, or otherwise degrading water quality, including temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity.

Water Resources – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts

12.a,c,e) Drainage and Surface Runoff Rate and Quality

Drainage: The project site is located within a Zone A100 year flood plain as shown on the Flood Insurance Rate maps published by FEMA. Drainage from the site sheet flows to the south and the east. The site is within the Laguna Channel watershed and is subject to flooding during major storm events. Drainage currently flows into the Laguna Channel and is conveyed to the ocean. Due to the low lying topography of the site and the limited capacity of the Laguna Channel, water ponds onsite and abutting streets act as overflow channels in major storm events. The project includes construction of curb drainage inlets to direct flows away from more impacted streets. A Preliminary Drainage Analysis Report prepared by Penfield and Smith dated February 2007 indicates that runoff from the site in a 25-year storm event would increase by 0.34 cubic feet per second with construction of the project (see Exhibit J). This would result in a 0.03% increase to runoff in the Laguna Channel watershed and is not considered substantial. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Surface Water Quality: Project grading activities create the potential for erosion and sedimentation affecting water quality. Surface water quality impacts are therefore considered potentially significant, but mitigable through implementation of erosion control measures. Numerous federal, state and local regulatory programs have been established to minimize impacts to water quality resulting from construction operations. Compliance with applicable regulations and the mitigation requirements provided below will reduce the potential for the proposed project to result in short-term construction-related water quality impact to a less than significant level.

Runoff of pollutants from parking areas could also degrade water quality. Compliance with standard City requirements would reduce the project's potentially significant long-term water quality impacts to a less than significant level. These requirements include the preparation of an operation and maintenance plan for the use of storm drain surface water

pollutant interceptors, stenciling of storm drain warnings of the direct connection of the drainage system to creeks and the ocean, and implementation of water quality protection best management practices (BMPs).

12.b) Flooding

The project site is within a Zone 'A' 100 year Special Flood Hazard Area as shown on the Federal Insurance Rate Map published by FEMA. The National Flood Insurance Program requires special construction to mitigate flood damage of new structures located in a SFHA as adopted in the City Municipal Code 22.24 'Floodplain Management'. As required, the project's lowest finished floor is designed at or above the Base Flood Elevation of 10.7 NAVD. Flood related impacts are considered less than significant.

12.d) Groundwater

The groundwater table onsite is high, measured at 0.2-0.6 feet below the surface in 1994 and 5-7 feet below the surface in 2004. The shallow groundwater is not utilized for drinking purposes. Site runoff could also come into contact with groundwater during project operation. Because of the shallow depth to groundwater, pollutants from parking areas could degrade groundwater quality. The use of storm drain surface pollutant interceptors would minimize potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

Water Resources - Mitigation

W-1 **Construction Erosion/Sedimentation Control Plan**. Project grading and construction shall be conducted in accordance with an approved erosion control plan to protect water quality throughout the site preparation, earthwork, and construction process. Prior to the issuance of a demolition or building permit for the proposed project, the applicant or project developer shall prepare an erosion control plan that is consistent with the requirements outlined in the *Procedures for the Control of Runoff into Storm Drains and Watercourses* and the Building and Safety Division *Erosion/Sedimentation Control Policy* (2003). The erosion control/water quality protection plan shall specify how the required water quality protection procedures are to be designed, implemented and maintained over the duration of the development project. A copy of the plan shall be submitted to the Community Development and Public Works Departments for review and approval, and a copy of the approved plan shall be kept at the project site.

At a minimum, the erosion control/water quality protection plan prepared for the proposed project shall address the implementation, installation and/or maintenance of each of the following water resource protection strategies: Paving and Grinding, Sandbag Barriers, Spill Prevention/Control, Solid Waste Management, Storm Drain Inlet Protection, Stabilize Site Entrances and Exits, Illicit Connections and Illegal Discharges, Water Conservation, Stockpile Management, Liquid Wastes, Street Sweeping and Vacuuming, Concrete Waste Management, Sanitary/Septic Waste Management, Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance, Vehicle and Equipment Cleaning, Vehicle and Equipment Fueling.

W-2 **Minimization of Storm Water Pollutants of Concern.** The applicant shall implement approved plans incorporating long-term storm water best management practices (BMPs) to minimize identified storm water pollutants of concern including automobile oil, grease and metals. The applicant shall submit project plans incorporating long-term BMPs to minimize storm water pollutants of concern to the extent feasible, and obtain approval from Public Works Engineering. The owners association shall maintain approved facilities in working order for the life of the project, and shall inspect annually and submit report to City annually.

W-3 **Storm Drain System Stenciling and Signage.** Within the project area, the applicant shall implement stenciling of all storm drain inlets and catch basins, and posting of signs at all public access points along channels and creeks, with language in English and Spanish and graphic icons prohibiting dumping, per approved plans. The applicant shall submit project plans to the satisfaction of Public Works Engineering that identify storm drain inlet locations throughout the project area, and specified wording and design treatment for stenciling of storm drain inlets and signage for public access points that prohibit dumping. The owners association shall maintain ongoing legibility of the stenciling and signage for the life of the project, and shall inspect at least annually.

W-4 **Trash Storage Area Design.** Project trash container areas shall incorporate approved long-term structural storm water best management practices (BMPs) to protect water quality: Trash containers shall have drainage from adjoining roofs and pavement diverted around the areas; and trash container areas shall be screened or walled to prevent off-site transport of trash. The applicant shall submit project plans to the satisfaction of Public Works Engineering and Solid Waste that incorporate long-term structural best management practices for trash storage areas to protect storm water quality. The owners association shall maintain these structural storm water quality protections in working order for the life of the project, and shall inspect at least annually

Water Resources – Residual Impact

Implementation of the identified mitigation measures would reduce surface and ground water quality impacts to levels of less than significant.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.		*YES*	*NO*
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildfire population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X
b)	Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?		X
c)	Does the project have potential impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?		X
d)	Does the project have potential environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	X	

INITIAL STUDY CONCLUSION

On the basis of this initial evaluation it has been determined that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, and further study in an Environmental Impact Report is required.

Case Planner/Initial Study Preparer: Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner

Environmental Analyst: _____ Date: _____
Debra Andaloro

EXHIBITS:

A. Vicinity Map

B. Project Plans

C. Photo-simulations, Peikert Group Architects, December 11, 2006

D. Architectural Board of Review Minutes, dated April 19, 2004, June 28, 2004, September 13, 2004, September 25, 2006

E. Geotechnical Engineering Report, dated December 8, 2006, prepared by Fugro West, Inc.

F. Results of Soil Vapor Survey and Soil Sampling Activities, dated April 2006, prepared by Padre Associates

G. County Fire Department Letters dated May 3, 2006 and July 20, 2006

H. Community Noise Analysis, Revised February 2007, prepared by URS Corporation

I. Revised Traffic, Circulation and Parking Study, dated April 12, 2007, prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers

J. Preliminary Drainage Analysis, dated February 2007, prepared by Penfield & Smith

LIST OF SOURCES USED IN PREPARATION OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

The following sources used in the preparation of this Initial Study are located at the Community Development Department, Planning Division, 630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara and are available for review upon request.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) & CEQA Guidelines

General Plan Circulation Element

General Plan Conservation Element

1995 Housing Element

General Plan Land Use Element

General Plan Noise Element w/appendices

General Plan Map

General Plan Seismic Safety/Safety Element

General Plan Update 2030: Conditions, Trends and Issues Report

Geology Assessment for the City of Santa Barbara

Institute of Traffic Engineers Parking Generation Manual

Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manual

Master Environmental Assessment

Santa Barbara Municipal Code

Special District Map

Uniform Building Code as adopted by City

H:\Group Folders\PLAN\Environ. Review\Initial Studies\535 E. Montecito St. Revised IS.doc